

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated March 26, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,895,450 (Sloo). Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,866 (Rosen).

By the present response, Applicants have canceled 3, 4 and 7-13. Applicants have amended claims 1, 5 and 6 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 remain pending in the present application.

36 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 7-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sloo. Applicants have canceled these claims therefore rendering these rejections moot.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo in view of Rosen. Applicants have canceled claims 3 and 4. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as to the remaining pending claims.

Sloo discloses a computer program and programmed apparatus for automatically handling and resolving user complaints against subjects. The program includes a routine for directing the apparatus to receive a complaint from a complainant against a subject, a routine for indicating the apparatus to receive from the subject a response to the complaint, a routine to direct the apparatus to store the

complaint and response in a data record, and a routine for negotiating a settlement of the complaint.

Rosen discloses a system for the open distribution of electronic money that includes a customer trusted agent associated with a first money module, emergent trusted agent that establishes a first cryptographically secure session with the customer trusted agent and associated with a second money module where the money modules establish a second cryptographically secure session. The merchant trusted agent accesses an authorization network and initiates an authorization process using information from an electronic money purchase or sale information and account credential from the customer trusted agent. Upon receiving authorization, the merchant trusted agent initiates a transfer of electronic money from the second money module to the first money module in the case of a purchase or initiates a transfer of electronic money from the first money module to the second money module in the case of a sale.

Regarding claims 1, 5 and 6, Applicants submit that neither Sloo nor Rosen, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, transmitting personal information on a sending party identified by ticket information from a ticket management processing apparatus to a deliberation support processing apparatus when the deliberation result indicates that the sent-out contents includes an illegality. Sloo merely discloses that a complaint is sent from a complainant to a subject thereby to settle a dispute. Sloo discloses that the dispute can be settled if the

complainant knows the whereabouts (e.g., a name, address, etc.) of the subject. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a system for resolving a dispute which has occurred based on a complaint against a libel/slander message (corresponding to "sent-out contents" in the claims) written onto a homepage (i.e., "capable of being browsed on a provider side processing apparatus"). According to the present invention, the deliberation of the dispute continues while maintaining anonymity of a user who wrote the message, and that only if the complaint is true and the message includes illegality is personal information of the user who wrote the message disclosed. Sloo discloses the subject being known to the complainant (see col. 5, lines 10-20).

The Examiner asserts that Sloo discloses accepting an input for designating sent-out contents capable of being browsed on a provider side processing apparatus connected via network at col. 3, lines 5-20. However, these portions of Sloo merely disclose that subjects may be any responsible person or entity, the hardware associated with the Sloo system, and that access terminals receive complaints and responses from users, deliver them to the central computer and receive transmissions from the central computer. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest anything related to a provider side processing apparatus connected to a network, or accepting an input designating sent-out contents, capable of being browsed, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest anything related to a browser, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Sloo discloses transmitting personal information on a sending party identified by information from a management processing apparatus to the deliberation support processing apparatus, and transmitting the deliberation results stored in the deliberation managing database and the personal information on the sending party received from the ticket management processing apparatus from the deliberation support processing apparatus to the deliberation requesting party side processing apparatus, at col. 9, lines 5-15. However, these portions of Sloo are not related at all to these limitations in the claims of the present application. This portion of Sloo merely discloses that a subject that prevails in the dispute may have a rating increased if the party prevailed against has a good reputation and may have a rating increased to a lesser amount if the prevailed against party has a poorer reputation, and that a program notifies the complainant and subject of the judgment, and that the performance of a judge and jurors may be monitored and stored. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest transmitting personal information on a sending party identified by ticket information from a ticket management processing apparatus to a deliberation support processing apparatus when the deliberation result indicates that the sent-out contents include an illegality, or transmitting the deliberation results stored in a deliberation managing database, as recited in the claims of the present application.

These portions of Sloo merely relate to a rating given to a subject who prevails over a party based on the rating of the party. These portions of Sloo do not disclose or suggest anything related to personal information of a sending party

identified by ticket information or transmitting personal information if the sent-out contents include an illegality.

The Examiner admits that Sloo does not disclose or suggest "ticket management apparatus", but asserts that Rosen discloses this limitation in col. 3, lines 50-65. However, these portions of Rosen merely disclose an electronic ticket such as a credential ticket that identifies an owner and permits specific privileges. The tickets disclosed in Rosen relate to electronic money purchases or sales. This is not a ticket information for identifying a sending party sending out designated sent-out contents capable of being browsed on a provider side processing apparatus, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Moreover, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine Sloo, that relates to a computer program for automatically handling and resolving user complaints against subjects, with Rosen, that relates to trusted agents for open distribution of electronic money. These two disclosures are from totally different subject areas and have no relationship with each other. Accordingly, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine these two references in an attempt to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. Further, as has been noted, this combination fails to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claim 2, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that none of

the cited references disclose or suggest accepting an input of inquiry contents towards a sending party to store the inquiry contents into a deliberation managing database, transmitting the inquiry contents and the ticket information stored in the deliberation management database to a ticket management processing apparatus, or making reference to a mail address indicated by a content address included in the personal information identified by the ticket information and transmitting the inquiry contents from the ticket management processing apparatus to the mail address.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Sloo nor Rosen, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/975,264

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.40756X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600